

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **September 22, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 26-49. Claims 26, 34, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Steinmetz Jr. (USPN 5,600,579, hereinafter “Steinmetz”). Claims 27-33, 35-41, and 43-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinmetz, in view of Hellestrand et al. (USPN 6,230,114, hereinafter “Hellestrand”).

/Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 31, 39, and 47 were rejected as being unpatentable over Steinmetz, in view of Hellestrand. The Examiner cites Microsoft Press’s Computer Dictionary and interprets the entry for “**thread**” to mean a function call. “Thread” is defined in Microsoft Press’s Computer Dictionary as “**a process** that is part of a larger process or program.”

Applicant respectfully points out that a practitioner with ordinary skill in the art views a “**thread**” as a **lightweight process** that is scheduled by either the kernel or thread scheduling tools (see the Wikipedia entry at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thread_%28computer_science%29, in particular, the heading “Processes, threads, and fibers”).

In contrast, a “**function**” is a subprogram, which is called rather than scheduled (see the Wikipedia entry at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Subroutine>). Threading provides benefits over function calls because a thread is separately scheduled and, if the program is running on a multi-processor, the thread can be run concurrently with the scheduling thread. With a function call, the calling program must wait for the function call to return.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 26, 34, and 42 to include the limitations from claims 31, 39, and 47, respectively. These

amendments find support on page 4, lines 9-21 of the instant application. Claims 31, 39, and 47 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 26, 35, and 42 are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 27, 29-30, and 32-33, which depend upon claim 26, claims 35, 37-38, and 40-41, which depend upon claim 34, and claims 43, 45-46, and 48-49, which depend upon claim 42, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47,615

Date: March 9, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665